The Johns Hopkins University

Foundations for a Study of Lysippus

STANFORD UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
JUN
1926

BY
FRANKLIN P. JOHNSON

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE BOARD OF UNIVERSITY STUDIES OF THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY IN CONFORMITY WITH THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

STANFORD UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
WITHDRAWN

OSCEOLA, MISSOURI
1925

PRESS OF REPUBLICAN, OSCEOLA, MISSOURI

781
.5J
LASSED
ssertation

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/foundationsforst0000fran

The Johns Hopkins University

Foundations for a Study of Lysippus

BY
FRANKLIN P. JOHNSON

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE BOARD OF UNIVERSITY STUDIES OF THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY IN CONFORMITY WITH THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

OSCEOLA, MISSOURI
1925

PREFATORY NOTE

My doctoral dissertation, presented at Johns Hopkins in 1921, consisted of ten chapters and an appendix of extracts from ancient authors. The first three chapters are published here with very little alteration. The remainder of the material, revised and supplemented through study in European museums, will be incorporated in a book which may be published within a year.

The dissertation was written under the direction of Professor David Moore Robinson, who suggested the subject and gave me a great deal of assistance of all kinds. It is a pleasure to record my gratitude for his encouragement and interest as well as for his constant and invaluable suggestions and his searching criticism.

ERRATA

P. 2, note 6: for "Poulsen, Delphi, pp. 320f" read "Poulsen, Delphi, pp. 291f". So on p. 3, note 14.

P. 3, note 12: for "Arch. Anz". read "Arch. Zeit".

P. 8, line 8: for "birth of Philip" read "death of Philip".

P. 8, note 38: for "Pruener" read "Preuner".

P. 10, note 49: for "pp. 266f" read "pp. 566f".

P. 11, note 55: for "p. 441" read "I, p. 682, no. 441".

P. 12, note 57: for "p. 453" read "p. 458".

P. 13, line 6: for "beruchmten" read "beruehmten".

P. 14, line 9: for "two of his signatures seem" read "one of his signatures seems".

P. 14, third line from bottom: for "Lampsalus" read "Lampsacus".

P. 16, line 5: for "exists" read "exist".

P. 17, note 6: for "XXXsV" read "XXXIV".

P. 17, note 7: for "O U M" read "OVM". So in other places.

P. 18, note 11: after "Annali dell' Instituto, XXII, 1850" read "pp. 223-251".

P. 19, note 16: for "p. 36" read "p. 86".

P. 20, note 22: for "Jh. Oest., I, VI, 1903, pp. 18ff" read "Jh. Oest. I., VI, 1903, pp. 16-31".

P. 32, note 6: for "Dicknis" read "Dickins".

P. 33, note 7: for "Pickard" read "Picard".

P. 34, no. 1: read "Gaz. Arch. X, 1885, pl. 8, 1".

P. 34, no. 5: read "Gaz. Arch. X, 1885, pl. 7".

P. 35, no. 8: for "Jagsthauren" read "Jagsthausen".

P. 36, line 8: after "Pompeii" read "(Not. Scav. 1902, p. 573)".

P. 36, note 15: for "III, 737" read "III, 73, 7".

P. 37, line 11: for "bended" read "bearded".

P. 38, line 3: for "Milkarth" read "Melkarth".

P. 38, no. 4: for "Mus. Woss." read "Mus. Wors".

P. 39, no. 8: for "D'Escamus" read "D'Escamps".

P. 41, no. 3: for "Ny. Carlsberg" read "Ny Carlsberg". So elsewhere.

P. 42, no. 5: for "p. 681" read "pp. 68f".

P. 47, line 10: for "Lanseum" read "Lauseum".

P. 47, note 57: for "322 B. C." read "322 B-C".

P. 48, line 9: for "concensus" read "consensus."

French and Italian words are printed without accents.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

The Life of Lysippus

CHAPTER II

Literary Evidence on Lysippian Art; the Apoxyomenos

CHAPTER III

The "Old Fountain" Base; the Polydamus Base; the Heracles Epitrapezius; the Eros

THE LIFE OF LYSIPPUS

All authorities agree that Lysippus was a native of Sicyon, in the northern Peloponnesus. This city had been notable in the history of Greek sculpture from the sixth century onward. Its artists apparently had always maintained close relations with the other notable Peloponnesian group of sculptors, in Argos; indeed it is doubtful whether the two cities were at any time the seats of distinct schools, in the proper sense of the word. They were rather the two chief centers of the great Peloponnesian school of sculpture; a school that had always worked chiefly in bronze, had always specialized in the representation of athletes, and had always, if our rather meager information is not misleading, excelled in formal and technical expertness rather than in the spiritual expression that was the chief aim of Attic art.

Lysippus naturally fell heir to these traditions, but whether he was actually a pupil of any older artist is doubtful. Our only information about his early life is given by Pliny,[1] who tells us, on the authority of Duris of Samos, that Lysippus had no teacher and that he was at first a coppersmith. It is well established that Duris was an extremely unreliable authority;[2] indeed, his inveracity was recognized in antiquity.[3] Nevertheless, he was a younger contemporary of Lysippus, and would hardly invent without reason a story in conflict with facts that would be well known at the time he wrote; so we may safely conclude that Lysippus did not study with any artist of great eminence,[4] and doubtless he did

(1) N. H. XXXIV 61; (2) Sellers, The Elder Pliny's Chapters on the History of Art, pp. XLVI ff. (3) Plutarch, Pericles, 28. (4) Klein (Gesch. d. griech. Kunst, II, p. 347) conjectures that the younger Polyclitus was Lysippus's master. His evidence is the Theban inscription (Loewy, Ins. griech. Bildh. 93) and Cicero, Brutus, 86,296. But the Theban inscriptions do not indicate

cast bronze for a living till his reputation as a sculptor was made. A young man beginning his career in such a way would naturally be less constrained by school traditions than one who had learned his art in the studio of a great master.

There is much disagreement among modern authorities as to the chronology of Lysippus's life. Collignon[5] places his birth in the second quarter of the fourth century, and his period of production between 350 and 300. This is the prevailing opinion among archaeologists; but several respectable authorities[6] believe that his life was earlier, approximately 390-320. The argument for this earlier dating is most fully set forth by Percy Gardner.[7]

Pliny, quoting from Duris in the passage already cited, speaks of the encouragment that Lysippus received from a response of the painter Eupompus. Pliny does not say that the response was given to Lysippus, and it is possible that he means that Lysippus heard of such a saying by Eupompus. More probably, however, Duris concocted a story to connect the great sculptor with the great painter of Sicyon; there are many such stories, of which the tale of Cimabue and Giotto is best known.[8] In view of the familiarity of the type and of the unreliability of the authority quoted, it seems hardly worth while to inquire how long Eupompus lived;—a point on which there is no decisive evidence. We know only that he was the teacher of Pamphilus, who was the teacher of Apelles,[9] and that Pliny considered him

collaboration and the passage in Cicero means little. Both points are discussed below. (5) Lysippe, p. 8. (6) Winter, Jb. Arch. I, VII, 1892, p. 169; Milchhoefer. Arch. Stud. H. Brunn, p. 66, note 2; Treu, Olympia, Ergebnisse, II, p. 211; Hyde, A. J. A. XI, 1907, p. 410; Maviglia, L' Attivita Artistica di Lisippo, p. 28; E. A. Gardner, Six Greek Sculptors, p. 316; Poulsen, Delphi, pp. 320 f.; Robert, Pauly-Wissowa, article on Eutychides. (7) J. H. S. XXV, 1905, pp. 243-248. (8) Sellers, Pliny, p. XLVII. (9) Pliny, N.

contemporary with Timanthes and Parrhasius.[10]

For his early date of the beginning of Lysippus's career Gardner relies on the statue of Troilus. It is mentioned by Pausanias,[11] and the dedicatory inscription, though not the artist's signature, has been preserved.[12] Pausanias clearly says that Troilus won in 372, and his words certainly imply that both victories were won then, though that is not an absolutely necessary conclusion. The inscription has usually been interpreted to mean that he won victories in successive Olympiads.[13] Dittenberger and Purgold say that the use of ἑξῆς makes this certain. Percy Gardner thinks that ἐφεξῆς shows that both victories were won at one session of the games.[14]

The word seems to be perfectly intelligible, whichever interpretation is adopted. He won an Olympic victory for the second time just after, or he won for the second time in the session of the Olympic games just after; ἐφεξῆς fits either interpretation.

Pausanias tells us that Troilus's first victory was in the big race and his second in the chariot race for colts; the inscription has ἵπποις in both cases. This is surprisingly indefinite; but it becomes explicable if we assume that the order of the events would make it clear what two contests were meant. The horse-races were all held on one day; the guadriga with colts was introduced into the games next after the biga, according to Pausanias,[15] and it is at least very well possible that the order of introduction was followed to some extent in the actual games. If this is

H. XXXV, 75. (10) Pliny, N. H. XXXV, 64. (11) VI, 1, 4. (12) Loewy, Ins. Griech. Bildh. no. 94. Discussed by Furtwaengler, Arch. Anz. XXXVII, 1879, p. 145; Dittenberger and Purgold, Olympia, Ergebnisse, V, p. 290. (13) Collignon, Lysippe, p. 19; Preuner, Ein delphisches Weihgeschenk, p. 27; Klein, Gesch. d. griech. Kunst, II, p. 347; E. A. Gardner, Six Greek Sculptors, p. 216 (14) J. H. S. XXV, 1905, p. 245; Winter (Jb. Arch. I. VII, 1892, p. 169) and Poulsen (Delphi. p.320) give 372 as the date for both victories. (15) V 8, 10.

so the quadriga with horses would be followed by the *κέλης*, which could not be referred to by *ἵπποις;* and the biga with colts was not introduced till later. The biga and the quadriga with colts would then be the only two successive events that could be meant by *ἵπποις*.[16] On the other hand, if two sessions of the games are referred to, we must conclude that Troilus did not care to particularize as to his victories.

The crux of the matter is the interpretation of *νικῆσαι Ὀλυμπιάδα*. Pausanias quotes an epigram of Simonides, which contains this expression:[17] *καὶ νικῶ πὶξ δυ' Ὀλυμπιάδας*. Frazer translates: "am victor in two Olympiads." The meaning "Olympic victory" is abundantly attested for *Ὀλυμπιάς*, however; many examples are cited by Liddell and Scott and Stephanus; so the expression could equally well mean "I win two Olympic victories in boxing." Herodotus[18] has several examples of *ἀνελέσθαι Ὀλυμπιάδα*, where the verb requires that *Ὀλυμπιάδα* shall be a direct object. This usage is common, and is apparently closely analogous to *νικῆσαι Ὀλυμπιάδα*, which ought to mean the same: to win an Olympic victory. Apparently, then, Troilus says "Zeus gave to me to win an Olympic victory the first time with prize taking horses, and the second time just after with horses"; and both his victories were won in 372, as Pausanias implies.

The date of a victory gives little more than a terminus post quem in dating a statue. The most natural course was to erect it at once, but any circumstance might cause a postponement. For an accurate date of the Troilus statue we must consider also the orthography of the inscription. Gardner[19]

(16) For a discussion of available evidence on the order of events at Olympia, see Gardiner, Greek Athletic Sports and Festivals, pp. 195-200. (17) VI, 9, 9. (18) VI, 103. (19) J. H, S. XXV, 1905, p. 245.

relates that he consulted Mr. Tod on the epigraphical indications, and that Mr. Tod thought the inscription should be dated between 400 and 360.

The most noticeable feature in it is the use of *o* for *ov*. As to this Roberts and Gardner[20] write as follows: "The similar use of *o* for *ov* lasted a little longer than *ε* for *ει;* but it almost disappears about 353 B. C., though also occasionally found in inscriptions of the latter part of the fourth century, especially in proper names, in the article, and in the case terminations." Larfeld[21] says substantially the same, and cites examples of such continued use for nearly every year down to 320. Now *o* for *ov* occurs only once in our inscription, and that is in a case ending. It follows that this feature does not force us to date the inscription before 360 or even before 353.

Dating it by other characters is made difficult by the facts that the alphabet did not change much during the period in question and that the letters are obviously very carelessly made.

Furtwaengler[22] places the inscription in the second half of the century and[23] compares it with the inscription of the victor Philip,[24] which is similarly engraved on a bronze plate and does not seem very different epigraphically. Dittenberger and Purgold date Philip's inscription rather after than before 300. On the whole it seems that the most reasonable date for the Troilus inscription is about 350. At any rate it is difficult to place it immediately after 372; and, if the statue was not set up at once, the length of the delay need not surprise us. Perhaps, as Loewy[25] suggests, the wording of the inscription may be taken to indicate a considerable interval be-

(20) Inscriptions of Attica, preface, p. XIII. (21) Handbuch der griechischen Epigraphik II, p. 462. (22) A. M. V, 1880, p. 30. (23) Arch. Zeit. XXXVII, 1879, p. 145. (24) Olympia, Ergebnisse, V, p. 302. (25) Ins. griech. Bildh., p. 76.

tween the victory and the dedication: τότε is most naturally so understood.

A block found at Thebes[26] contains epigrams for two statues of athletes, with the signatures of Polyclitus and Lysippus. The epigram belonging to the statue by Lysippus is fragmentary, but we can make out that it was a statue of Coridas, who won the pancratium for boys in the Pythian games. Preuner has shown[27] that Coridas could not have won before 342, since the contest was first held at Delphi in 346 and Coridas was not the winner then.[28] Thebes was destroyed by Alexander in 335 and restored by Cassander in 316; so no statue was set up there between those dates. The statue of Coridas, then, was dedicated either between 342 and 335 or after 316. Perhaps we may go still further: the Pythian festival in 338, within a few days of the battle of Chaeronea, probably had few competitors and especially few from Thebes; and besides it is unlikely that many statues were dedicated in Thebes during the troubled period between 338 and 335. Thus the image of Coridas, if earlier than 316, is probably to be dated 342 or soon thereafter.

It is agreed that the epigraphical character of the inscription indicates a later date than 335. It may be assumed, however, that the existing inscriptions are renewals, made when the old statues were set up again after the rebuilding of Thebes.[29] This hypothesis is suggested by the fact that the younger Polyclitus, according to the chronology commonly accepted, can not have been working after 316. It may derive some confirmation from the fact that Lysippus calls himself "Sicyonian", as he does in no

(26) Leowy, Ins. griech. Bildh., no. 93; I. G. VII, 2533 (27) Bonner Studien, p. 219. (28) Pausanias, X, 7, 8,; apparently the author was confused in V, 8, 11. (29) So Furtwaengler, Masterpieces, p. 224 note 2; Preuner, Ein delphisches Weihgeschenk, p. 27; Pomtow, Jb. Arch. I. XXXII, 1917, p. 136.

other signature. This seems more natural in a young artist; but no one will attach great weight to this consideration. It might further be argued that the two statues obviously have no connection with each other, and so could not have been set up together and must have been reerected; but this is not sound, because the block is not an ordinary statue-base, but an architectonic member, on which statues of victors may have been set as they were made.[30] The case for a renewal of the inscriptions, then, rests wholly on the assumption that no sculptor named Polyclitus was active after 316.

Unless we are to believe, with certain scholars[31] that there were three sculptors named Polyclitus in the fifth and fourth centuries, the assumption is almost certainly sound. Pausanias[32] mentions a Polyclitus, "an Argive, not he who made the image of Hera, but a pupil of Naucydes." The chronology of Naucydes is well established;[33] he can not have lived much later that 400, and his pupil can not have been active after 316. The probability then is that the inscriptions are renewals and that the statue of Coridas was originally set up just after 342.

A few years later, probably, Lysippus made a statue that stood on the parapet around the "Old Fountain" at Corinth. The base, with his signature, is preserved.[34] Very similar epigraphically is the signature found at Thermon.[35] The dedicatory inscription on the same block can not be earlier than 280, because Heraclea was only then admitted to the

(30) So Brunn, Sitzb. K. Bayr. Akad., 1880, p. 465. (31) Dittenberger, in I. G. VII, 2533; Fraenkel, in I. G. IV, p. 338; and formerly, at least, Doerpfeld, in Das griech. Theatre, pp. 130 ff; cf, Rom. Mitt. XVII, 1902, p. 339. (32) VI, 6, 2. (33) See Robert, in Hermes XXXV, 1900, pp. 190f. (34) Powell, in A. J. A. VII, 1903, p. 30. (35) Pomtow, in Jb. Arch. I. XXXII, 1917, pp. 133-136.

Aetolian League, according to Pausanias;[36] but the sculptor's signature is of distinctly earlier type; so Pomtow is justified in concluding that the statue or at least the base was used a second time.

Powell and Pomtow date the two inscriptions about 325. The great similarity of the two indicates that they belong to about the same time, but I should suggest a date shortly before the birth of Philip. The forms of the letters are at least as favorable to this date as to a later one, and the statues, apparently of no great importance, seem to belong to the youth of the artist rather than to the time of his association with Alexander.

Pausanias[37] tells of a statue of a great athlete, Polydamas of Scotussa. Polydamas won a victory in 408, certainly before Lysippus was born. The statue was probably set up during the period of Thessalian prosperity and alliance with Philip, beginning in 352. If we assume that the statue was dedicated by the people of Scotussa, we have a *terminus ante quem* in 321.[38]

We have a great deal of testimony on Lysippus's connection with Alexander. Pliny[39] says that he made many statues of the conqueror "a pueritia eius orsus." We need not understand from this, however, that the series began earlier than about 340, when Alexander was sixteen. We have no record of any relations between Lysippus and Philip; so it is not probable that Lysippus was especially favored at the Macedonian court until Philip's death in 336. That monarch apparently preferred Euphranor and Leochares; each of them portrayed him and Alexander together.[40] When Alexander ascended the throne, however, Lysippus assumed the position of court sculptor.

(36) X, 21, 1. (37) VI, 5, 1-7. (38) So Bluemner ad. loc. and Pruener, Ein delph. Weihgesch. p. 26. (39) XXXIV, 63. (40) Pliny, N. H. XXXIV, 77; Pausanias, V, 20, 10.

It is stated by many authors[41] that no other sculptor was allowed to portray the king. Perhaps this is not to be taken too literally, but it is clear that Lysippus was his chosen sculptor. Unfortunately only one of his royal commissions can be definitely dated; the great series of statues set up at Dion, in commemoration of the battle of the Granicus[42] must have been made in 334 or shortly thereafter, since this is the date of the battle.

Among the most famous of Lysippus's work were a Zeus and a Heracles, both colossal, at Tarentum.[43] These are the only works in Magna Graecia known. It is obvious that only an artist who had already achieved great success would have been summoned to make such important and expensive statues; besides, they must have taken a great deal of time, and it is improbable that Alexander would have released his favorite for so long a trip while he was himself in Greece. Now Alexander of Epirus, uncle of Alexander the Great, went in 332 to assist the Tarentines against the Lucanians and Messapians. He was successful until his death in 326. It seems very probable that Lysippus went with him, soon after he finished the Granicus monument. A. Reinach[44] thinks that Lysippus could hardly have gone to Tarentum during the life of Alexander the Great, and dates the trip 316-306. There is no particular reason for his going at that time, however; besides, the Tarentines had become estranged from Alexander of Epirus before his death, and proteges of his house were probably not popular there later.

Pausanias[45] mentions a statue of a wrestler Chilon, which he saw at Olympia. Chilon fell in battle; and Pausanias remarks that he might have died

(41) Pliny, N. H. VII, 125; Plutarch, Alexander 4, 1; etc. (42) Arrian, Anabasis I, 16, 4. (43) Pliny N. H. XXXIV, 40. (44) Neapolis, I, 1913, p. 28. (45) VI, 4, 6. (46) VII, 6, 5.

either at Chaeronea, in 338, or in the Lamian war in 322. Later[46] he mentions that the guide at Patrae told him that Chilon fought at Lamia; that in fact he was the only Achaean to do so. Since the statue was set up after his death it must have been made after 322.

Plutarch[47] speaks of a bronze group, the lion-hunt of Alexander and Craterus, which was made by Lysippus and Leochares and dedicated at Delphi by Craterus. The inscription belonging to the group has been found.[48] From it we learn that the group, though vowed to Apollo by Craterus the general of Alexander, was set up by his son Craterus. Now the elder Craterus fell in 321, fighting as an ally of Antipater against Eumenes and Perdiccas. It is reasonable to assume that the monument was being made at the time of his death, but was not then completed. Apparently a number of years passed before it was actually set up; for the younger Craterus could not have been a year old at his father's death, and the epigraphical character of the inscription seems to indicate a date fairly well along in the third century.[49]

Athenaeus[50] relates that Lysippus designed a special kind of jar for Cassander, when that general founded Cassandria. The chief export of the new city was wine, and Cassander realized the value of a container that would attract attention and be recognized everywhere. This story is altogether credible in itself and does not seem reasonably explicable as an invention. Cassandria was established in 316, which is therefore our next date in the career of Lysippus.

(47) Alexander, 40. (48) B. C. H. XXI, 1897, p. 599. (49) So Perdrizet, in J. H. S. XIX, 1899, pp. 274 f. (B. C. H. XXII, 1898, pp. 266 f.); Poulsen (Delphi, p. 292) would date it about 320. (50) XI, 784.

A lost inscription, known from a copy by Pietro Sabino,[51] has been taken to indicate that Lysippus made a portrait of Seleucus Nicator after 306, when he took the title of king. The orthography shows that the inscription was not an original of the time of Lysippus; presumably it was placed on a copy of his portrait. In that case it would be very natural for the copyist to add the word *βασιλεύς*, if it was not present in the original inscription. This inscription then, is only another indication of his activity in the circle of Alexander.

An inscription found at Delphi contains a reference to a decree to be inscribed on the base of the chariot of the Rhodian people.[52] A large substructure was found, well suited to the support of a chariot group.[53] The inscription on it is fragmentary, but indicates a dedication by the Rhodian state. This is undoubtedly the chariot referred to in the other inscription.

Pliny[54] mentions as an especially famous work of Lysippus a "quadriga cum sole Rhodiorum." This has naturally been understood to mean a quadriga at Rhodes; but that is perhaps not an absolutely necessary interpretation. Pomtow[55] believes that the chariot stood on this base at Delphi. The inscription, in his judgment and that of Hiller von Gaertringen, can be dated about 300, though it would more naturally be placed later. Pomtow thinks that the group was dedicated soon after 304, when Demetrius Poliorcetes raised his siege of Rhodes.

That is a possible date for the quadriga of Lysippus, though we are told that the colossus of Chares was dedicated then and might expect similar information about the quadriga. The Rhodians were

(51) Loewy, Ins. griech. Bildh., no. 487, No. 477 is the same; see Loewy, in Jb. Arch. I. II, 1887, p. 72. (52) B. C. H, XXXV, 1911, p. 462. (53) B. C. H. XXV, 1911, p. 457. (54) N. H. XXXIV, 63. (55) Dittenberger, Sylloge 3, p. 441.

prosperous all through the third century and may have set up many quadrigas. It is known that there was a famous chariot with the Sun in Rhodes itself, since Cassius Dio[56] relates that Cassius, when he captured Rhodes, took away all the sacred things except the chariot of the Sun. It is hard to doubt that this was the quadriga of Lysippus. The base at Delphi supported another chariot, not necessarily with the Sun, which the Rhodians dedicated some time in the third century.[57]

Another signature was found at Megara.[58] It appears on two of a number of large stones, which apparently formed the base for a large group of sculpture. Loewy suggests that this was the group of Zeus and the Muses by Lysippus which Pausanias saw in Megara.[59]

Pomtow[60] accepts this identification, but tentatively suggests that the inscription may be a renewal of about 250. It certainly looks later than any of others: the bars of the sigma are parallel and the letters stop just short of apices. In this respect, however, there is only a slight advance on the Leochares-Sthennis inscription,[61] in which, too, there is one sigma with parallel bars. Larfeld[62] cites a few examples of this form from the end of the fourth century, though unfortunately none of them is free from doubt. It seems better to conclude that this form of sigma was used occasionally about 300 than to assume that the inscriptions were renewed: a suggestion that has not been made, so far as I know, with regard to the Leochares-Sthennis inscription. But the Lysippian signature at Megara must be dated very late; probably

(56) XLVII, 33, 4. (57) So Bourguet, B. C. H. XXXV, 1911, p. 453, and R. Arch. VII, 1918, pp. 220 f.; Poulsen, Delphi, p. 293. (58) Loewy, in A. M. X, 1885, pp. 145-150; I. G., VII, no. 38. (59) I 43, 6. (60) Jb. Arch. I. XXXII, 1917, p. 136. (61) Loewy, Ins. griech. Bildh., no. 83. (62) Handbuch d. griech. Epigraphik II, p. 470.

after 300.

A signature was found at Lindos in Rhodes,[63] but no facsimile or description of it has been published, so far as I know. "Ein reizendes hellenistisches Epigramm der Basis einer Kinderstatue von einem Lysippos (vielleicht nicht dem beruchmten)" was found in Cos,[64] but has apparently remained unpublished.

Another signature, found at Corinth,[65] was dated by Powell about 325, though he noted a difference from the other Corinthian signature already mentioned, in that the bars of the sigma are parallel. Kendall K. Smith[66] believes, largely on this ground, that the signature is not contemporary with Lysippus, but is a renewal of the late third century; and this is probably right. The stone was probably part of the facing of some large substructure. The cutting, which is difficult of explanation in connection with any sort of statue, was probably made later when the stone was used for some other purpose.

Several further chronological indications may be noted. Lysippus is never mentioned as a contemporary or rival of Scopas or Praxiteles. Pausanias,[67] in speaking of his bronze Eros at Thespiae, says that Praxiteles had made his Eros previously. He is mentioned as collaborating with only one sculptor, Leochares, whose activity certainly belonged chiefly to the second half of the century. Lysippus's fellow favorite Apelles was certainly late: Pliny[68] mentions him in connection with Ptolemy and Antigonus, after they became kings. The same author[69] gives Lysippus's own "floruit" as 328-325. That is of no great value, as it is probably taken from Alexander's

(63) Bull. de l'acad. royale des sciences et des lettres de Danemark, 1907, p. 24. (64) Arch. Anz. XX, 1905, col. 11. (65) A. J. A. VII, 1903, p. 29, no. 4. (66) A. J. A. XXIII, 1919, p. 392. (67) IX, 27, 3. (68) N. H. XXXV, 89-90. (69) N. H. XXXIV 51.

date. Pliny[70] also records a tradition that he made 1500 statues. The number is incredible, but the existence of such a tradition indicates great productiveness and hence a long life. In an epigram[71] the sculptor is addressed as "Old Lysippus."

From all this evidence there is no indication of any work before 350; only one has been found that is probably much before 340. On the other hand, two of his signatures seem to be rather after than before 300. Undoubtedly, then, the majority of scholars have been right in placing his birth in 375 at the earliest, and he probably lived nearly till 290.

As to the course of his life in his later years we have little information. After his return from Tarentum, in 326 or somewhat earlier, he may have rejoined Alexander in Asia; the features of a portrait of Alexander, which is attributed to him with great probability, seem to be those of a man of thirty. In 320, however, he was in Greece again: the Craterus group and the statue of Chilon belong to that period. Since he was associated with Craterus, the ally of Antipater, and with Cassander, the son of Antipater, it may be that he enjoyed special favor with that house. His pupil Chares, if not Lysippus himself, was engaged by the Rhodians to celebrate their victory over Cassander's arch-enemy Demetrius. Apparently no feeling of loyalty to the great Alexander restrained the artist from seeking the favor of his bitterest enemy. There is a considerable time after 316 during which we lose sight of him; perhaps he was in Asia Minor, where he had hardly spent much time before, though he was active at Rhodes, Myndus, and Lampsalus at some time. The late signature from Megara indicates that his last years were spent in Greece. Petronius[72] seems to

(70) N. H. XXXIV, 37. (71) Anth. Pal. XVI (Plan. App. IV.) 332. (72) Satirikon 88.

say that he died of hunger; but we need not seriously consider that. From the success enjoyed by his sons and pupils we may infer that his own prestige did not decline as long as he lived.

CHAPTER II

LITERARY EVIDENCE ON LYSIPPIAN ART; THE APOXYOMENOS

Our information on the characteristics of Lysippus's sculpture is not extensive. Even when it is supplemented by detailed description of certain works, the picture remains so incomplete that there exists wide differences of opinion as to the proper application of the term "Lysippian" and as to the extant works that may be accepted as representative of his style. The literary evidence on the sculptor's art may be analyzed in connection with the identification of one of his most famous works, the "apoxyomenos".

Pliny[1] opens his list of Lysippus's works with this statue. That is the only passage of any author in which it is mentioned, and the closest scrutiny will not extract much information from it. Its position at the head of Pliny's list and the space that he devotes to it, as well as his tale of the favor that it enjoyed in Rome, indicate that it was regarded as a masterpiece. The story about Tiberius would suggest that the statue had some flavor of effeminacy or immaturity or both.

A further hint may be drawn from the attribution to Lysippus's son Daippus of a "perixyomenos"[2]. An apoxyomenos is one who scrapes himself off; a perixyomenos is one who scrapes himself around. Any perixyomenos could be called an apoxyomenos, but not all apoxyomenoi would be perixyomenoi. *Περιξύω* is a rather rare word, and it appears that no form of it is applied to the use of a

(1) N. H. XXXIV 62. (2) Pliny, N. H. XXXIV 87.

strigil except in the cases of Daippus's statue and of another statue by Antignotus,[3] who belongs to the time of Augustus.[4] It seems probable that the term was applied to Daippus's statue especially to distinguish it from the apoxyomenos of his father. The περι element then, must have been noticeably more prominent in the one statue than in the other.

Lysippus was not the only Greek sculptor to win fame with an apoxyomenos. In addition to the perixyomenoi of Daippus and Antignotus, Polyclitus made an apoxyomenos[5] and Daedalus of Sicyon made two.[6] Several types to which the name could be applied exist in extant remains of sculpture. It may be desirable to mention several of them.

A grave-relief found at Delphi[7] obviously belongs to a period before 450, Then there is a type that appears only on gems.[8] It is said to occur on many gems, with no considerable variation. It is a reasonable inference that they are all imitations of a famous statue, and this statue is exactly what we should expect an apoxyomenos by Polyclitus to be. The posture and proportions are obviously Polyclitan, and there can be little doubt as to this identification.

A bronze in Cortona[9] represents a youth holding a strigil. I have seen no satisfactory illustration of it, but apparently it is a rude work. A bronze statuette in Treves[10] appears to represent a type otherwise unknown. We can not be sure, however; not only is its preservation very poor, but it must

(3) Pliny, N. H., XXXIV, 86. (4) So Robert, in Pauly-Wissowa s. v.; Loewy's doubts (Ins. griech. Bildh., no. 314) seem unnecessary. (5) Pliny, N. H., XXXIV, 55. (6) Pliny, N. H. XXXsV, 76. (7) Forschungen in Ephesos, I, p. 197, fig. 146; Hyde, O U M., p. 138. (8) Furtwaengler, Masterpieces, p. 262, fig. 109; Antike Gemmen, pl. XLIV, 18-19; Hartwig, in Jh. Oest. I., IV, 1901, p. 155, figs. 183 f. (9) Micali, Mon. Ined., XVII, Reinach, Repertoire, II, p. 547, 3. (10) Forschungen in Ephesos, I, p. 200 f.

have been a miserable piece of work when it was new. It seems clear at least that the athlete is cleaning the strigil. In the Boston Museum there is a bronze left arm, about half-size, which has not been published. It was broken off a little above the elbow, which is bent at an obtuse angle. The hand holds a strigil; the little finger is next the blade, not the thumb as in the Vatican statue. The anatomy is very much emphasized, and seems clearly to indicate a Hellenistic origin.

The famous apoxyomenos, long accepted as a copy after Lysippus, is in the Vatican.[11] It seems to be the only example of its type. A torso in Athens[12] seems to have had a similar position of the arms, but the weight apparently rested on the right leg; so the general rhythm must have been altogether different. The remains of the arms are scarcely sufficient to render it certain that the torso represented an apoxyomenos at all. Its workmanship is said to be poor.

Of another type[13] the most reliable example, per-

(11) Amelung, Skulpt. d. Vat. Mus. I, pp. 86 ff.; Helbig, Fuehrer 3 no. 23; Brunn-Bruckmann, 281 and 487; Hyde, O U M pl 29; Bulle, Schoene Mensch 2 pls. 62 and 213; for details, 106, 110, 111, 196; good illustrations also in text, col. 117, fig. 22; Von Mach, University Prints, no. 235. For the statue's correspondence with literary evidence on Lysippian art, Braun's article (Annali dell' Instituto, XXII, 1850) is still good. Loewy's little book, "Lysipp und seine Stellung in der griechischen Plastik", is chiefly valuable for its treatment of the apoxyomenos as representing a certain stage in the development of art. Schick (Neue Jahrbuecher, XXXIII, 1914, pp. 18 ff.) has some good notes along the same line, together with valuable morphological observations. Michaelis (J. H. S., IV, 1883, pp. 335 ff.) treats certain proportions as compared with those of other statues. The principal discussions of the apoxyomenos since the discovery of the Agias are those by Amelung (R. M., XX, 1905, pp. 136-155), Koepp (Neue Jahrbuecher XXIII, 1909, pp. 480-486), and Percy Gardner (J. H. S., XXV, 1905, pp. 234 ff.). (12) Koehler, in A. M., II, 1877, pp. 57 f. and pl. IV; Einzelaufnahmen, no. 722. (13) Best discussion of the type and its various replicas: Forschungen in Ephesos, I, pp. 181-204 (Benndorf).

haps, is in the Uffizi.[14] Bloch[15] discusses it in connection with a small statue in the Louvre. By the remains of certain supports in the latter he argues for a restoration as an athlete pouring oil from a lecythus into an aryballus.[16] Furtwaengler denounces such a subject as unparalleled, unclassical and absurd,[17] but does not seem definitely to reject it so far as the Louvre figure is concerned. It seems that Block was mistaken in believing that the two works were derived from one original; for thou gh the left hand of the statue in the Louvre and other indications apparently prove that Block's restoration for it is approximately if not altogether right, there is abundant evidence that the Florence athlete was an apoxyomenos.

A statuette in Boston[18] differs perceptibly from the larger statue. The body is boyish and chubby, while the Uffizi athlete represents a mature athlete. Yet a comparison of illustrations leaves no doubt they are derived from one original; the differences are precisely those that would be expected to exist between a faithful copy in the original size and a pretty little decorative figure. A similar difference appears in a comparison of the heads. The contrast between the manly vigor of the Florence athlete and the immobile comeliness of the statuette is very noticeable, especially in the profile views; yet the forehead, the hair, with its short tufts brushed to the right in front, the eyes, and the mouth make it certain that both works are derived from one original. The motive is

(14) Amelung, Fuehrer durch Florenz, no. 25; Furtwaengler, Masterpieces, pp. 261 ff; Bulle, Der Schoene Mensch,2 col. 116; without restorations, Forschungen in Ephesos, I, pp. 193. The head: R. M., VII, 1892, pl. III; Bulle, op. cit., cols. 473, 476. (15) R. M., VII, 1892, pp. 81-105. (16) As in the sketch, R. M., VII, 1892, p. 36. (17) Masterpieces, p. 261. (18) Discussed by Hartwig, in Jh. Oest. I, IV, 1901, pp. 151-159, pls. V-VI.

unmistakable in the statuette: the athlete held the strigil in his left hand and cleaned it with his right. Like the Cortona statuette, it is not, strictly speaking, an apoxyomenos; but doubtless the term would be applied to it.

The same original is represented also on gems.[19] A head in the Hermitage is unmistakably a copy, and a very good one.[20] A head in the Museo Torlonia[21] is said to be a copy, though much worked over. A relief in Vienna[22] represents the statue set up between the columns of a gymnasium. A fragmentary statue found in Rome[23] seems to be a copy.

The most interesting statue in the list of replicas is the colossal bronze found at Ephesus.[24] A comparison with the Florence athlete shows differences; apparently the bronze was a free Hellenistic imitation rather than an exact copy. The action in the statue as restored is different: the athlete is scraping his left forearm instead of cleaning the strigil. This difference affects the appearence very little and is doubtless to be explained as a happy modification by the Hellenistic artist.[25] The face of the bronze statue is rounder and softer, but the characteristic render-

(19) Furtwaengler, Masterpieces, pp. 261 f.; Forschungen in Ephesos, I, p. 198. (20) Kieseritzky, Hermitage, p. 26, no. 65; good illustration in Forschungen in Ephesos, I, p. 199. (21) Visconti, Monumenti del Museo Torlonia, pl. XXII, no. 86; Forschungen in Ephesos, I, p. 199. (22) Discussed by Hartwig, in Jh.Oest., I, VI, 1903, pp. 18 ff. and pl. II; Forschungen in Ephesos, I, p. 198. (23) B. Comm. Arch. XXXIX, 1911,pp. 99 ff. Mariani suggests that it may be a copy of the Uffizi apoxyomenos or of the Munich oil-pourer. Mme. Maviglia (L'Attivita artistica di Lisippo, p. 23) rightly notes that the second hypothesis can not be right, since the right arm is lowered. (24) Forschungen in Ephesos, I, pp. 181 ff., frontispiece, pls. VI-IX; Bulle, Der Schoene Mensch 2 pl. 60; Brunn-Bruckmann 682 and (the head) 683-685. (25) Benndorf (Forschungen in Ephesos, I, pp. 201 f.) is somewhat doubtful of the correctness of the restoration.

ing of the hair is again evident and the similarity of all the forms is such as to leave no doubt of a common original for the two statues.

Here is an impressive list of replicas, certainly.[26] If a statue's celebrity is to be judged by the imitations of it that remain, this was decidedly the most famous of all apoxyomenoi. Judging from the literary testimony, the most famous of all apoxyomenoi was made by Lysippus. Mme. Maviglia has combined the two lines of evidence and has suggested that the statue in the Uffizi and its fellows represent the true apoxyomenos of Lysippus. Her thesis and arguments deserve careful consideration.

In the beginning[27] she accepts the views of Percy Gardner in regard to Lysippian chronology. These we have found to be wrong. She observes also that the Vatican apoxyomenos shows a knowledge of anatomy impossible in the time of Lysippus.[28] Here also she follows Gardner;[29] but we have no such exact knowledge of the progress of anatomical science as would justify such a positive statement.

These points are only incidental to Mme. Maviglia, however. She bases her repudiation of the Vatican apoxyomenos on two pieces of literary evidence. Pliny[30] says that Lysippus modified the proportions used by older artists; but the Vatican apoxyomenos shows an entirely new system of proportions; hence it can not reproduce the work of Lysippus. Furthermore, Lysippus is represented as

(26) Several doubtful examples are discussed by Benndorf. The head mentioned by him (p. 199, note 3)as for sale in Rome is now in Brussels (Cumont, Cat. Mus. Royaux, no. 5). Mme. Maviglia (op. cit., pp. 23 f.) includes in her list the Treves bronze and the gems referred by Furtwaengler to a Polyclitan original. In the former case she may be right. (27) Op. cit., p. 28. (28) Loc. cit. (29) J. H. S., XXV, 1905, pp. 236 ff. So Fowler, History of Sculpture, p. 119. (30) N. H., XXXIV, 65.

declaring himself the pupil of the Doryphoros of Polyclitus;[31] this shows conclusively that he did not depart radically from Polyclitan usage, and confirms the testimony of Pliny that he only modified the old proportions.

I have not seen much discussion of this thesis,[32] but it does not seem that any one without a theory to prove would interpret the evidence as Mme. Maviglia does. Polyclitus was recognized as a great artist, perhaps particularly as a great formal artist and technician, and the Doryphoros seems to have been made as an example of his methods and principles; it would naturally be studied by all young sculptors, especially by those of the Peloponnesian schools. In exactly the same way young painters of the present day may profitably study the frescoes of the Brancacci chapel, though they do not purpose painting exactly in the manner of Masaccio. There is no reason for supposing that Lysippus meant any more than that, if he called himself a pupil of the Doryphoros.

As for the passage in Pliny, surely the natural and reasonable interpretation is that Lysippus made important changes in the system of proportions. Why would the matter have been mentioned at all, if Lysippus had "adopted the Polyclitan canon in his fundamental scheme and brought to it only slight modifications?"[33] The successors of Polyclitus were eminent artists; it is highly probable that many of them made slight modifications. Could the chief contribution to art of so eminent a sculptor as Lysippus consist in slight modifications of the old canon? If they were considered so important, we should

(31) Cicero, Brutus, 86, 296. (32) Reinach's review (R. Arch., XXIV, 1914, pp. 157 f.) is non-committal. I have not seen the reviews in Litt. Zent., LXVII, 1916, p. 39 and Wo. Kl. Ph., XXXIV, 1917, p. 7. (33) Maviglia, op. cit., p. 17.

hear a great deal of the artist that did introduce the new system; but we must assume that he is mentioned only among the many pupils of the great masters. These arguments against the Lysippian character of the Vatican apoxyomenos are not convincing.

Passing then to a consideration of the Uffizi type, Mme. Maviglia observes[34] that according to Pliny the work of Lysippus was famous, and that the Uffizi apoxyomenos is shown by the number of its replicas to have been famous. There can be no doubt of that; and the lack of replicas of the Vatican type is disturbing. The explanation probably is that the statue is very difficult to copy in marble.[35] The sculptor of the copy preserved, who was no mean workman, thought it necessary to use a support for the outstretched arm, which must have marred the effect greatly. Thus, while the abundance of replicas of the Uffizi type proves its celebrity and to that extent supports its claim to Lysippian authorship, the lack of copies of the Vatican type does not indicate the contrary for it.

Mme. Maviglia finds[36] that the Uffizi type represents the canon of Polyclitus with slight modifications. It is certainly much closer to Polyclitus than is the Vatican type;[37] rather too close for a natural interpretation of the passage in Pliny. Yet in one respect it differs decidedly from the Doryphoros, where the Vatican type is in accord with it: that is in the shape of the head. Mme. Maviglia explains this[38] by a passage[39] in which it is implied, as she thinks, that Lysippus made heads as Myron did. A glance at the passage in its context shows that the

(34) Op. cit., p. 19. (35) So Von Mach, Handbook of Greek and Roman Sculpture, p. 245. (36) Op. cit., p. 25. (37) Bloch discusses the proportions, R. M., VII, 1892, pp. 102 f. (38) Op. cit., p. 26. (39) Auctor ad Herennium, IV, 6.

author was discussing methods of teaching, not art; he says that Lysippus taught by his own work, not that of others. Any other three artists would have done as well, for his purpose, as those actually named. An obvious objection to the attribution of the Uffizi type to Lysippus is the fact that it has generally been dated near the beginning of the fourth century. Bloch,[40] Furtwaengler,[41] and Amelung[42] are substantially in agreement on this point, and Kalkmann[43] said it was much earlier than the Hermes of Praxiteles. Bulle,[44] however, seems inclined to bring it nearly to 350, and Benndorf[45] places it about 360. Mme. Maviglia[46] herself brings it down only to 350, which would be at the very beginning of Lysippus's career. All the commentators have noted the resemblance between the Uffizi athlete, the Munich oil-pourer and the discobolos attributed to Naucydes or Alcamenes. Both of these statues have usually been ascribed to the fifth century. Obviously the consensns of opinion, founded of course on considerations of style, as to the date of the Uffizi type, is not favorable to its attribution to Lysippus.

Lysippus seems to have expressed a good deal of spirit and emotion in his figures. He adequately expressed the leonine majesty of Alexander[47] and the pathos of the weary Heracles.[48] The Vatican apoxyomenos is not lacking in expression. The suhject does not permit any very vigorous emotionalism, but the face does give an impression of gentle meditation, very different from the serenity of fifth century art. It is this latter manner that appears in the

(40) R. M., VII, 1892, p. 103. (41) Masterpieces, pp. 260 ff. (42) Skulpt. d. Vat. Mus., I, p. 120. (43) Arch. Anz., VI, 1891, p. 140. (44) Der Schoene Mensch (2) col. 113. (45) Forschungen in Ephesos, I, p. 192. (46) Op. cit., p. 26. (47) Plutarch, De Alex. Mag. Fortuna aut Virtute, II, 2. (48) Nicetas Choniates, De Signis Const., 5.

Uffizi athlete, and reenforces the other evidence which indicates that it belongs to a period distinctly earlier than that of Lysippus.

I said at the beginning that we should expect to find the apoxyomenos of Lysippus effeminate or immature or both. The Boston statuette does look immature, but no other representative of that type does; and the statuette is clearly not an exact copy. The Uffizi statue has not the slightest appearance of immaturity or of effeminacy. The body of the Vatican statue, on the other hand, has along with its highly developed muscularity a slenderness and grace that would make the story about Tiberius explicable. The expression also is suitable.

With regard to the Uffizi apoxyomenos a definite conclusion is possible; it was not the work of Lysippus. It is opposed to all the evidence both for Lysippus in general and for his apoxyomenos in particular. Its style is too early for the time of Lysippus; its proportions are not those that can reasonably be attributed to Lysippus; its serenity of countenance is not to be expected from Lysippus. It has not the effeminacy or the immaturity that Lysippus's apoxyomenos must have had.

Hauser[49] attributes this type to Daedalus of Sicyon, and believes that the Ephesus bronze is the original. He notes that Daedalus is credited by Pliny with two apoxyomenoi, that there appear to be two slightly divergent types of this work, and that an inscription of Daedalus was found at Ephesus. It hardly seems probable, however, that an artist would make two statues so nearly alike; it is much more likely that the variation in the Ephesus bronze is due to the Hellenistic adaptor. Furthermore, all commentators before Mme. Maviglia had

(49) Jh. Oest. I, V, 1902, pp. 213-218. Michaelis seems to approve (Springer-Michaelis, 8th ed., p. 259). So Fowler (Fowler and Wheeler, p. 267).

considered the type Attic: it has been likened chiefly to the Munich oil-pourer and to the standing discobolos, both frequently believed to be Attic, and bears no small resemblance to the Hermes of Praxiteles.[50]

To this Hauser replies that we do not know how far the schools kept themselves distinct during the early years of the fourth century. In the fifth century it is possible to trace Polyclitan influence in Attic art even in its greatest days; and the sculptures of the Argive Heraeum, though certainly Polyclitan in the main, show so much Attic influence that Furtwaengler for a time insisted that they were entirely Attic. It is very reasonable to suppose that at the beginning of the fourth century, when no great figure predominated anywhere, the two schools were fused into one.

The type was very probably created in the lifetime of Daedalus,[51] and if his work is preserved at all it is certainly in this series of statues. Its resemblance to the standing discobolos has been noted, but it is surely somewhat later. If the discobolos is the work of Naucydes, the apoxyomenos could very well be the work of Daedalus. The two conjectural identifications, neither reliable in itself, tend to confirm each other. The attribution of the discobolos to Alcamenes is of course a pure guess, generally abandoned since the discovery of the true head. On the whole it seems quite likely that the apoxyomenos type is derived from Daedalus, but the Ephesus bronze can not be accepted as the original work: first because it is not good enough to be an original by an artist of Daedalus's standing, and second because its defects—softness, weakness, lack of definition—are those characteristic of the Hellenis-

(50) See especially Forschungen in Ephesos, I, p. 191.
(51) On his chronology see Robert, in Hermes, XXXV, 1900, pp. 191 f.

tic age.[52]

The Vatican statue is, or at least in the present state of our knowledge appears to be, the work of an innovator, of an independent and unconstrained genius. The Uffizi type and the Treves bronze—if it deserves separate classification—follow closely the apoxyomenos of Polyclitus; and the bronze in Cortona, though its proportions look Lysippian and the position of the feet is one—and the only one—known positively to have been used by Lysippus,[53] is apparently derived from an unimpressive and unoriginal work, which would not be notable among the works of Lysippus; that is, if it had any prototype at all. The left arm in Boston clearly belongs to a Hellenistic work. The great work in the Vatican has clearly a very much better claim to Lysippian authorship than any other statue recognizable as an apoxyomenos.

It has the stage of artistic development, the proportions, and the tinge of effeminacy that are to be expected in the statue of Lysippus. The vivid rendering of the hair; the small head; the extreme delicacy of execution[54]—all these characteristics, in addition to those previously mentioned, are ascribed to Lysippus, and all appear in the apoxyomenos of the Vatican as well as could be expected in a copy.

There is only one consideration that militates against an unqualified acceptance of the statue as representing the work of Lysippus. That is the attribution of a perixyomenos to Daippus. It can not be denied that the Vatican type, in contrast to statues following the old Polyclitan scheme more or less, might very naturally be called a perixyomenos. Furthermore, we learn[55] that Euthycrates did not im-

(52) Dickins (Hellenistic Sculpture, p. 34) says that this statue "belongs to a later development of the Scopaic school." The statement is scarcely intelligible. (53) See chapter III. (54) Pliny, N. H., XXXIV, 65. (55) Pliny, N. H., XXXIV, 66.

itate the refinement of his father, and that he used "an austere rather than a lighter style of execution". In the absence of any information on the style of the other two brothers, we may infer that they were unlike Euthycrates in this respect; and certainly the Vatican apoxyomenos is neither austere nor lacking in refinement. Daippus's statue was apparently well esteemed, since Pliny selected it as the one work to represent the sculptor in his list.[56]

In these circumstances an attribution to Daippus must be regarded as a distinct possibility; yet the old view is better. We have no reason to suppose that Daippus was capable of such work as this. The fact that so excellent a workman should make a copy of a work so ill adapted to marble suggests that the original enjoyed not only moderate esteem but great celebrity. Besides, if this is not the Lysippian work, we are compelled to believe that not a trace of it remains, in spite of its popular favor. Even if the Vatican type were derived from Daippus, however, it would be little less valuable in identifying other Lysippian works. It is not likely either that Daippus wandered far from his father's footsteps or that many of his works are preserved to us.

In view of the importance of this statue to a study of Lysippus, it deserves very careful observation. The rich musculature of the body is more easily seen than described; but we may note the triangular depression between the muscles at the waist and the distinct division between the muscles in the calf of the right leg at bottom.[57] The roundness of the shoulders, the rich modeling of the back, and the very deep groove along the spine are noticeable. The navel is shallow, with a crescent-shaped line above it. The pubic hair occupies a very small area,

(56) N. H., XXXIV, 87. (57) These two points are stressed by Gardner, in J. H. S., XXV, 1905, p. 238.

of roughly semicircular shape. The hands and feet are very carefully made, with much attention to their anatomy. The feet are long and rather flat. The fingers of the antique left hand are rather fleshy. Veins are visible in the backs of the hands and elsewhere. The neck is rather thick than slender; the larnyx is marked off by grooves above and below it.

The restless hair, though an important Lysippian characteristic, hardly lends itself to description. The crown of the hair is set low in the back. The unrestored right ear is rather long and narrow; the inner cartilage is broad; the lobe has a distinctly different curve from the rest of the ear. The hair closely approaches the outer corners of the eyes. The face as a whole is broad, almost round. The dolichocephalous form of the head has been mentioned.

The forehead is divided by a horizontal groove; the part above this groove is set farther back than the part below it, which includes more than half the space above the eyes. The eyes are small, not only in proportion to the face in general but also to the eyesockets. They are set deep under the brows and are further shaded by the upper lids, which are much thicker than the lower lids. The eyes are not widely opened, and the surface of the eyeball shows practically no vertical curvature. The two lids are similarly curved. There is an especially deep hollow outside of and below the outer corner of the eye. The eyes are set in close to the narrow nose, which is very little broader at the base than at the bridge.[58] The upper lip, though not thin, is very little modelled; the central depression and the red border are hardly marked at all. The border of the lower lip is well marked, in a roughly rectangular form. There is a deep hollow between the lower lip and the

(58) It is somewhat restored, but not enough to invalidate this observation.

chin, which is broad, solid, and rather long.

CHAPTER III

THE "OLD FOUNTAIN" BASE; THE POLYDAMAS BASE; THE HERACLES EPITRAPEZIUS; THE EROS

It seemed best to begin the study of works attributed to Lysippus with the apoxyomenos, partly because of the prominence it has always had in the study of Lysippus, partly because of its interest as a work of art, and partly because, being well preserved and easily accessible in reproduction, it offered a good opportunity for the interpretation of the evidence given by ancient authors. There are several extant monuments, however, which can be connected with Lysippus in a more direct and unquestionable way.

I have spoken already of an inscription on a base found at Corinth.[1] The leaded fastenings for the feet of the statue are still in position in their cuttings on the top of the base, and it is possible clearly to understand the position of the feet.[2] The left foot pointed almost straight to the front; the right foot was set at some distance to the side—the cuttings are 33 cm. apart at the point of nearest approach—a little in front, and turned outward; the back end of cutting is 20 cm. from the side of the base, the front end only 14 cm. The weight evidently rested on the left foot. This position appears in the Cortona bronze mentioned in the preceding chapter. For the benefit of Mme Maviglia we may mention that it is exactly the position of the Munich oil-pourer, whose resemblance to the Uffizi apoxyomenos has often been noted. It is interesting to

(1) Chapter I. (2) A drawing of the base; A. J. A. VII, 1903, p. 31.

know that this position was used by Lysippus; but it was clearly used long before his time, and it can not be assumed that he used no other in his standing figures.

This base is the only existing monument from which evidence that is obviously and indisputably dependable can be obtained, in regard to Lysippian art. There is another base, however, which undoubtedly supported a work of his: his statue of the famous athlete Polydamas.[3] No evidence remains as to the position of the statue; but the reliefs on the base, described by Pausanias,[4] have been found at Olympia. There is no actual proof that Lysippus had anything to do with these sculptures; but it is eminently probable that he would have charge of everything connected with the statue, and that the sculptures of the base were made by his pupils and under his supervision; probably the master himself modelled the groups in clay.

The sculptures[5] are badly damaged, but we can still determine the subjects and something of the style. Polydamas's struggle with the lion was represented in at least two episodes: in one he is wrestling with the beast, while in the other the struggle is nearly or quite finished. The figures are slender; the postures are free and vigorous.

The best preserved scene shows Polydamas's exploit before Darius. The king, seated on his throne, looks on while his champions are dispatched by the Greek; the ladies of the harem are also present. It is interesting to compare this relief with the sculpture of the Praxitelean base at Mantinea,[6]

(3) See Chapter I for date. (4) VI, 5, 1-7. (5) Olympia, Ergebnisse III, pp. 209-211, pl. LV, 1-3; Frazer, Pausanias, Vol. IV, p. 18. (6) For arguments against the connection of this base with the great Praxiteles, see Vollgraff's article (B. C. H. XXXII, pp. 236-258, 1908) and citations there. His conclusions do not seem to me to be substantiated. They are accepted by Dicknis (B. S. A. XXI, p. 7).

which it resembles more or less both in subject and in composition. In the Polydamas relief the figures are perceptibly more slender, as would be expected in a Lysippian work. There is also a notable lack of the charming serenity and repose of the Mantinean group; this is apparent in a comparison of the similarly seated figures of Apollo and Darius. The ladies of the harem, too, are much livelier than the Muses; though that is hardly a fair comparison. This spirit of unrest is perceptible in the drapery also. In comparison with the garment of Apollo, rendered in broad, harmonious lines reminiscent of the Parthenon frieze, the robe of Darius appears almost sensational with its many small folds at the top, and its large, obtrusive folds at the bottom. It would be most interesting to see how the drapery was arranged on the upper parts of the feminine figures, but unfortunately those parts are almost entirely destroyed. In the lower parts, however, something of the same difference can be seen: the folds are smaller and less regular than in the Mantinea relief, even where the more restless position does not require it.

Of the few works of Lysippus that are described by ancient authors in such detail that copies of them would be easily recognizable, only one seems to exist in extant sculpture: the Heracles Epitrapezius.[7] It is described by Martial[8] and by Statius.[9] It was a small bronze, less than a foot high, in the possession of Novius Vindex. The hero was seated on a rock over which the lion-skin was placed. In his left hand he held a club, in his right hand a cup. His gaze was directed upward. On the base appeared the name of Lysippus.

(7) Best discussion by Weiszaecker, Jahrbuch, IV, 1889, pp. 105-112. Most recent treatment by Pickard, R. A. XVII, 1911, pp. 257-270. (8) Epigrammata IX, 43 & 44. (9) Silvae IV, 6.

A rather bizarre history for the statuette is given, which throws a certain doubt on everything connected with it. Yet it seems virtually impossible that such an attribution would falsely be made at that time, when all the critical literature of which the scraps appear in Pliny was extant and various works of Lysippus existed in Rome, especially in view of the fact that the statuette so attributed was very well known. That it was well known is proved by the number of replicas existing. They may be enumerated as follows:[10]

1. Marble statuette in Louvre, height 38 cm.; Gaz. Arch. X, 1885, 8, 1; Reinach, Repertoire, II, 228, 2.

2. Marble statuette in Louvre, height c.35 cm.; Gaz. Arch. X, 1885, pl. 8, 2; Reinach, Repertoire, II, 228, 5; Collignon, Lysippe, fig. 13.

3. Bronze statuette in Constantinople, height 5 cm.; Olympia, Ergebnisse, III, p .236; Reinach, Repertoire, III, 73, 3.

4. Marble statuette in British Museum, no. 1725, height 50 cm.; Museum Marbles X, pl. 41, 3; Reinach, Repertoire, I, 466, 3.

5. Cast from a lost statuette in Ecole des Beaux-Arts, height 46 cm.; Gaz. Arch. X, 1885, pl. 8, 2; Reinach, Repertoire, I, 469, 3; Collignon, Sculpture grecque, II, p. 425, fig. 221.

6. Marble statuette once in Rome, height 40 cm.; American Art Review II, p. 54;

(10) The list is mostly copied from Weiszaecker.

Reinach, Repertoire, III, 73, 1; mentioned Matz-Duhn, no. 125.

7. Limestone statuette in British Museum, no. 1726, height 50 cm.; J. H. S. III, pl. 25; Reinach, Repertoire, II, 227, 3. Signed by Diogenes.

8. Bronze statuette in Jagsthauren, height (without lower part) 14 cm.; Jb. Arch. I. IV, 1889, pl. 3; Reinach, Repertoire, II, 227, 1.

9. Bronze statuette in Florence, height 42 cm.; Galleria di Firenze Ser. IV, vol. III, pl. 107; Reinach, Repertoire, I, 474, 7.

10. Cast in Dresden from lost original; mentioned by Treu, in Olympia, Ergebnisse, III, p. 236.

11. Fragmentary marble statuette found at Delos; mentioned by Picard in R. Arch. XVII, 1911, p. 269.

Coin of Amastris, time of Caracalla; Waddington-Babelon-Reinach, Recueil des Monnaies Grecque d'Asie Mineure, p. 53, pl. XXI, 3; Mionnet, Description de Medailles Antiques, Supplement IV, 563, 86, pl. XII.

Of these nos. 1-4[11] show almost exactly the same position, which may be regarded as the original one: the right foot pressed back against the rock, the left foot advanced a little, the club held almost upright at the left. Nos. 5 and 6 deviate from this position only in that the club is more nearly horizontal. It is uncertain how much of the original of no. 5 is re-

(11) No. 4 is largely restored; I do not know whether the position of the club was indicated by remains.

stored; the arms, at least, are new, according to Ravaisson;[12] nos. 7 and 8 are freer imitations; while there is a reasonable doubt whether no. 9, which is much restored, should be included in the list at all.[13] I have seen no illustration of no. 10 or 11. A free imitation was found in Rome.[14] The marble statuette found at Olympia[15] is of quite distinct type. A bronze statuette found at Pompeii is also of a different type. It answers very well to the descriptions of Martial and Statius; but since it has no such array of replicas as the other type, and is considerably larger than the work of Lysippus (height 75 cm.), we need not consider it.

There can be no doubt that at least six statuettes reproduce with approximate exactness the type described by the poets, while several others show the unmistakable influence of that original. There is no other work mentioned in literature from which they could be derived. The type offers no feature that is unexpected in a Lysippian work; on the contrary, there is an obvious affinity with the Heracles at Tarentum.[16] Surely there can be no hesitation in accepting the statuette as an example of Lysippian art.[17]

Of the six close copies, only nos. 1, 2 and 5 have been well published. The treatment of anatomy in these three is not entirely the same, but it is very similar. The musculature is rich and treated with considerable detail. Nos. 2 and 5, at least, show dis-

(12) Gaz. Arch. X, 1885, p. 37. (13) Weiszaecker argues for its inclusion, in Jahrbuch IV, 1889, p. 110. (14) Not. Sc. 1889, p. 245; Reinach, Repertoire, III, p. 248, 9. (15) Olympia, Ergebnisse, III, pl. LIX, 1, p. 235 ff.; Reinach, Repertoire, III, 737. (16) Nicetas Choniates, De Signis Const., 5. (17) It has very generally been accepted, though scholars have not given it much attention. Murray (History, II, p. 350) rejected the whole story on the ground that Alexander would not ask Lysippus to make such a piece of table decoration.

tinctly the triangular depression between the muscles at the waist. A roistering Heracles naturally has not exactly the same sort of torso as a trained athlete such as the apoxyomenos; yet there is great similarity, especially if no. 2 be taken as the representative of the Heracles. As to the type of head, there is a disturbing uncertainty whether the head of no. 5 is original. No. 4 is said to have a head of the same type as the colossal bust commonly considered a replica of the Farnese type.[18] At any rate the original head was bended.

These statuettes certainly deserve more careful study than they have received heretofore, since they clearly represent the only work of Lysippus that is certainly identifiable on external evidence. Without casts or further illustrations, however, it is impossible to draw very complete inferences as to the character of art that they represent.

A word should be said as to the purpose of the statuette. It has generally been assumed that it was simply a table-piece: "Heracles on the Table." Picard[19] cites several passages of Hesychius in which the word *ἐπιτραπέζιος* is used in connection with *πάταικος;* and *πάταικοι* are well accredited Phoenician deities. Ordinarily, it seems, they were placed in ships for good luck,[20] a *πάταικος ἐπιτραπέζιος* would presumably be placed on the table for a similar reason, and a Heracles Epitrapezius would be such a figure Hellenized.

All this is plausible. Probably this was the source of the name for the statue, and probably it was made in 332,[21] at the time of Alexander's Phoenician campaign. It would be just after the Granicus monument, and just before the trip to Tarentum. We

(18) British Museum, no. 1736. (19) R. Arch. XVII, 1911, p. 261. (20) Herodotus III, 37. (21) So Picard, p. 265.

need not follow Picard, however, in believing that the statuette represented in any particular sense the Tyrian Heracles or Milkarth.[22]

Of all the works that have been attributed to Lysippus because of their resemblance to the apoxyomenos, none is more interesting than the Eros stringing the bow. This most charming figure was apparently, in antiquity, decidedly the most popular representation of the adolescent Eros. Thanks to the fact that the bow serves as a support for the outstretched arms and makes a copy in marble fairly easy, we have a large number of replicas. Klein[23] listed 29 examples, including variants, besides six replicas of the head alone and reliefs and gems. As several replicas have been found since Klein wrote, I am presenting a complete list, retaining Klein's numbers for those in his enumeration:

1. Capitoline Museum, Galleria no. 5; Jones, Museo Capitolino, p. 87, pl. 18; Reinach, Repertoire, I, 352, 7; Helbig (3) I, p. 426.

2. Louvre, Froehner, no. 329; Reinach, Repertoire, I, 142, 3.

3. Ny. Carlsberg; Arndt, Glyptotheque, p. 172, Catalogue 1907, no. 180; Reinach, Repertoire, II, 427, 5.

4. Brocklesby Park; Michaelis, Anc. Mar., p. 240, Mus. Woss. I, p. 97.

5. Villa Albani; Helbig (2) II, p. 16; Reinach, Repertoire, I, 354, 8.

6. Vatican, Museo Chiaramonti, no. 495; Amelung, Skulpt. d. Vat. Mus. I, p. 633, pl. 67; Reinach, Repertoire, III, 261, 5;

(22) Picard, p. 261. (23) Praxiteles, p. 230 f.

Collignon, Lysippe, fig. 14.

7. Berlin; Ant. Skulpt. no. 138; Friederichs, Amor mit dem Bogen des Hercules, plate; Reinach, Repertoire, II, p. 427, 2.

8. Louvre; Froehner, no. 327; D'Escamus, pl. X; Reinach, Repertoire, II, p. 427, 1.

9. Brussels, Musees Royaux: Cumont, Catalogue, no. 16; Furtwaengler, Collection Somzee, no. 39; Palais de San Donato, p. 198; Reinach, Repertoire, I, 357, 7 and II, 427, 3.

10. Museo Torlonia; Visconti no. 171; Arch. Zeit. 1879, p. 76; Reinach, Repertoire, II, 427, 6.[24]

11. Karlsruhe. Von Duhn, Catalogue of Casts in Heidelberg, p. 95.

12. Despuig collection in Majorca; Huebner, Ant. Bildw. in Madrid, no. 702; Reinach, Repertoire, II, 427, 4.

13. Venice, Museo Archeologico; Duetschke, Ant. Bildw. in Oberitalien V, no. 99; Arch. Zeit. XXX, 1873, p. 84, no. 35.

14. Louvre; Froehner, no. 328; Reinach, Repertoire, I, 142, 7.

15. Castle Howard; Michaelis, Anc. Mar., p. 326, no. 7; Reinach, Repertoire, I, 359, 2.

16. Vatican, Galleria dei Candelabri.

(24) I take Reinach's word for it (Repertoire, II, p. 427) that this is the statue once in the Giustiniani collection (Repertoire, I, 352, 1, reversed?), though it is hard to believe it from the two drawings.

17. Lateran; Benndorf-Schoene, Ant. Bildw. d. Lat. Mus., no. 224.

18. Rome, Palazzo Patrizi; Matz-Duhn, Ant. Bildw. in Rom, no. 253.

19. Venice, Museo Archeologico; Duetschke, op. cit. V., no. 201. This is Reinach, Repertoire, IV, 275, 6 and Einzelaufnahmen 2533 (cf. Arch. Anz. XXXV, 1920, col. 16).

20. Florence, Giardino Torrigiani; Duetschke, op. cit. II, no. 457.

21. Louvre, no. 1776; Reinach, Repertoire, II, 458, 8.

22. British Museum; Catalogue III, p. 66, no. 1675; Reinach, Repertoire, III, 127, 5.

23. British Museum; Catalogue III, p. 64, no. 1673, Museum Marbles, X, pl. 21; Reinach, Repertoire, I, 358, 7.

24. Hermitage; Kieseritzky, Hermitage, no. 342; Reinach, Repertoire, III, 127, 3.

25. Venice, Museo Archeologico; Duetschke, op. cit. V, no. 166; Reinach, Repertoire, I, 360, 3; Arch. Zeit. XXX, 1873, p. 86, no. 102.

26. Pawlowsk; Stephani, Antiken zu Pawlowsk (Memoires de l'academie imperiale de St. Petersbourg, Series VII, vol. 18, 1872), no. 5; Reinach, Repertoire, I, 355, 7.

27. Vatican, Museo, Chiaramonti, no. 653; Amelung, Skulpt. d. Vat. Mus. I, p. 755, pl. 81; Reinach, Repertoire, III, 261, 3.

28. Wilton House; Michaelis, Anc. Mar. p. 695 f.; Reinach, Repertoire, I, 357, 8.

29. British Museum, no. 1674; Catalogue III, p. 65 f.; Reinach, Repertoire, I, 357, 6; Bulle, Der Schoene Mensch,[2] no. 63.

30. Philadelphia University Museum; Museum Journal V, 1914, p. 117.

31. Benghazi; Gaz. des Beaux- Arts XIV, 1918, pp. 1-5; Cron. B. A. V (Sup. Boll. Arte), XII, p. 30; Notiz. Arch. II, 1916, p. 43; R. Arch. XII, 1920, p. 141, no. 3; J. H. S. XLI, 1921, pl XVII, 2 and pp. 242 ff.

32. Vatican, Belvedere, no. 15; Amelung, Skulpt. d. Vat. Mus. II, p. 44, pl. IV.

33. Montauben; Reinach, Repertoire, II, 427, 7.

34. Duval-Morillon Collection, near Geneva; Reinach, Repertoire, III, 127, 1; Einzelaufnahmen, 1914.

35. In possession of Bardini, at Florence, in 1897; mentioned Reinach, Repertoire, II, p. 427.

36. Found at Lemnos; R. Arch. III, 1916, p. 157.

HEADS

1. Berlin, Ant. Skulpt. no. 152.

2. Blundell Hall; Michaelis, Anc. Mar. p. 371, no. 193.

3. Ny. Carlsberg; Arndt, Glyptotheque, pl. 124, p. 172; Catalogue 1907, no. 181.

4. Rome, Barracco Collection; Matz-Duhn, op. cit. no. 298.

5. British Museum, no. 1680; Catalogue III, p. 681.[25]

6. Dresden; Hettner[4] no. 189.

7. Vatican, Museo Chiaramonti, no. 607 A; Amelung, Skulpt. d. Vat. Mus. I, p. 720, pl. 77.

8. Paris; Mon. Piot. XIII, 1906, pp. 140-148, pl. XI-XII and figure on p. 139.

9. Baltimore, Walters Art Gallery; Art in America, V, 1917, p. 192 ff.

10. Museo Torlonia; mentioned R. M. I, 1886, p. 114, no. 92.

11. Hermitage; Kieseritzky, Hermitage, no. 52.

RELIEF

Sarcophagus in Cephesia; Robert, Die antiken Sarkophagreliefs II, pl. III.

GEMS

1. Berlin; Furtwaengler, Geschnittene Steine no. 1603.

2. Berlin; Furtwaengler, Geschnittene Steine no. 3701.

3. Petrograd; Furtwaengler, Antike Gemmen III, pl. XLIII 60, II, p. 210.

(25) I suppose this is the head noted by Klein. It is not recognized in the catalogue as belonging to the type. Sieveking (Berl. Phil. W. XXV, 1905, col. 519) says it is a replica, and I judge that he is right, though it is not a very good one.

4. Unknown possessor; Furtwaengler, Antike Gemmen III, pl. XIV 9, II, p. 67.

A terracotta statuette found at Myrina may show the influence of the type.[26] It is possible that the Eros in the painting found at Pompeii[27] is connected with this type. The torso in Naples, which Ruesch[28] calls a replica, seems very doubtful. The ponderation is of the usual type, but the arms and head are reversed. If a modification of the Eros, it was a most unhappy one.

The various replicas, though varying greatly in quality and faithfulness, are sufficiently in agreement to make reconstruction of the original certain on most points. The little god rested his weight on the left foot; the right was set a little distance to the side; the knee was bent and the heel was raised a little from the ground. The left arm passes downward across the body and the hand holds the middle of the bow; the right arm is stretched out almost straight from the shoulder, and the hand is fastening the string. Not much of the bow is preserved in any replica except no. 23; but that, and fragmentary remains in other cases, indicate that it was of the usual double-curved or Scythian type. The lower end of the bow was pressed against the calf of the right leg, as is shown in a gem (no. 3) and by remains discernible in some of the replicas (e. g. no. 6). In no. 31 the position of the bow is different. The lower curve of the bow evidently touched the right thigh, as in nos. 23 and 26, or closely approached it; a dowel-hole in the thigh of the Capitoline example (no. 1) may indicate a short supporting bar. No. 23 is the

(26) La Necropole de Myrina I, pl. VI, p. 290 ff. A replica of the terracotta is said to exist in Berlin (Myrina II, p. 291). (27) R. M. XVI, 1901, p. 340. (28) Guida, p. 158, no. 495; Reinach, Repertoire, II, 608, 7.

only copy, I think, in which the wings are entirely, or even mostly, original; they are small and elegant in form, but these qualities are to some extent characteristic of that replica in general. Since the quiver always either forms the support or hangs on it, we must conclude that there was no quiver in the bronze original. This adds some probability to Friederichs's[29] hypothesis, founded on the presence of a lion-skin in several replicas, that Eros is supposed to have stolen the bow of Heracles. It has generally been recognized, however, that the bow is not disproportionately large, as it surely would be if it were supposed to belong to Heracles.

In the early days of dilettantism this figure was frequently identified with the Eros by Praxiteles at Thespiae, which was so highly regarded. Modern authorities have generally abandoned this theory, though it is said that Revaisson-Mollien supported it in 1908,[30] and Dr. Bates[31] apparently considers Prax iteles the sculptor naturally to be mentioned in connection with the statue. Lysippus also had an Eros at Thespiae,[32] and Collignon,[33] Klein,[34] Furtwaengler,[35] Studniczka,[36] Loewy,[37] Arndt,[38] and Cumont[39] confidently find evidence of his style in the replicas preserved. Mme. Maviglia[40] thinks the attribution confirmed rather than weakened by her discovery of the Uffizi apoxyomenos. Michaelis,[41] Helbig,[42] Jones,[43] Edward Robinson,[44] and Bulle[45] are more or

(29) Amor mit dem Bogen des Herkules. (30) Bull. des Antiquaires de France, 1908, pp. 147-8. (31) Museum Journal I, 1910, p. 31. (32) Pausanias IX, 27, 3. (33) Lysippe, p. 68. (34) Ges. d. griech. Kunst, II, p. 359. (35) Masterpieces, p. 394. (36) Neue Jahrbuecher, XLI, 1918, p, 21. (37) Griechische Plastik, p. 104. (38) Glyptotheque. de Ny. Carlsberg, p. 172. (39) Cat. des Mus. Royaux, no. 16. (40) Op. cit. p. 67 ff. (41) Springer-Michaelis (8) p. 297 (42) Fuhrer (2) no. 437. (43) Museo Capitolino, p. 87. (44) Catalogue of Casts in Boston, 1896, p. 249. (45) Schoene

less doubtful; while Wolters,[46] Amelung,[47] Smith,[48] and Reinach[49] regard the statue as Hellenistic.[50] Dickins[51] seems to recognize some type of Eros as Lysippian; I suppose it is this one.

The attribution to Praxiteles seems rightly to have been abandoned. No figure that can be traced with any probability to him shows such lively action, expressed in a monentary posture. On the other hand, the definite arguments against an attribution to Lysippus are not convincing. Wolters[52] once argued that the statues of Praxiteles and Lysippus both were temple-statues; the type in question, he said, certainly does not look like a temple-statue, so it could not be either of them. This must have been a mere slip; there is no reason whatever for supposing that Lysippus's Eros was a temple-statue. He objected also that the childish character of the subject was too well portrayed for any time before the Alexandrine period. That, however, is difficult of demonstration. Smith[53] doubts whether the arrangement of the hair—parted on both sides, with the locks between plaited along the middle line—occurs as early as Lysippus; but apparently it occurs much earlier.[54]

It has very generally been recognized that there is great similarity between the apoxyomenos and the Eros in the bodily forms. The ponderation too is very similar. Both figures are represented in unstable positions, which endure but a moment; the weight is swinging toward the figure's right. The analogy in this matter is very striking, and proves definitely that the Eros is not earlier than Lysippus. Ame-

Mensch (2), col. 122. Apparently he thought better of the hypothesis on further consideration (col. 671). (46) Friederichs-Wolters, no. 1582. (47) Helbig-Fuehrer, (3) no. 776. (48) British Museum Catalogue, III, p. 65. (49) Myrina II, p. 291. Perhaps he has changed his mind; cf. R. Arch. XII, 1920, p. 140. (50) So Ghizlanzoni, Not. Arch. II, p. 43. (51) Hellenistic Sculpture, p. 32. (52) Friederichs-Wolters, p. 637.

lung,[55] who recognizes all this, nevertheless argues that the face is too unlike that of the apoxyomenos or any other Lysippian figure to allow an attribution to him.

In the Metropolitan Museum casts of the apoxyomenos and the Capitoline Eros are placed near each other, and I have been able to compare them under favorable circumstances. The Eros has no restorations on the head, except the tip of the nose. The eyes are not like those of the apoxyomenos: they are larger in proportion to the size of the face, they are farther apart, they are wider open, and there are no hollows at the outer corners. All these differences, however, correspond to, if they are not necessitated by, the difference in the subject. Such deeply shadowed eyes as those of the apoxyomenos have never yet occurred in a child, and the wide-open eyes express alertness, as they are intended to do. The hair is in long, straggling locks, necessarily different from the closely cropped hair of the athlete. The general shape of the face is like that of the apoxyomenos, as are the forehead and the ears. The characteristic narrow nose and the still more characteristic upper lip, as well as the lower lip, are exactly in the style of the apoxyomenos. Head no. 3 agrees with no. 1 so closely as to indicate that they faithfully represent the original. Head 8 agrees in general, though the nose is broader and the ears are not so much like those of the apoxyomenos. The resemblance between these heads and the head of

(53) British Museum Catalogue III, p. 65. (54) Steininger, in Pauly-Wissowa VII, 2125. (55) Helbig (3) I, p. 426. He sees resemblance to the heads of Menander, which he attributes to the sons of Praxiteles. The resemblance does not seem altogether convincing. Besides, the attribution of these busts to Cephisodotus and Timarchus rests on the feeblest evidence. (Most recent discussion: Studniczka, Neue Jahrbuecher, XLI 1918, pp. 1-31).

the apoxyomenos, in the points where similarity could reasonably be expected, seems sufficient, when considered together with the resemblance in body and posture previously mentioned, to remove all reasonable doubt that they represent originals of one artist.

Recently a brilliant suggestion by Frickenhaus[56] has confirmed this conclusion with literary evidence. Cedrenus[57] enumerates the statues that were destroyed in the Lanseum in Constantinople, in 476. There were the Lindian Athena, by Dipoenus and Scyllis, the Cnidian Aphrodite of Praxiteles, the Samian Hera by Bupalus and Lysippus, the winged Eros with a bow, from Myndus, the ivory Zeus of Phidias, and the image of Time by Lysippus. The reference to Bupalus and Lysippus as joint authors of the Samian Hera is so patently absurd that students have ignored it. Frickenhaus observes, however, that while the comments on the other statues show some inaccuracies, they contain no such absurdities as this; and that the name of Lysippus certainly belongs to the "winged Eros with a bow, from Myndus," which is named just after the Hera and, alone of all the statues, has no sculptor named for it. A glance at the passage shows the extreme probability of this correction, and one wonders only that it remained for Frickenhaus, in 1915, to suggest it.

Cedrenus is not as good an authority as one could wish; but his testimony, confirming the conclusions reached by many authorities from morphological evidence, leaves no doubt as to the authorship of the Eros. Like the Heracles Epitrapezius, it may be accepted as a work that certainly represents an original from the hand of Lysippus. Myndus is in Caria. The Eros resembles the apoxyomenos so closely that it was pretty surely made after 316,

(56) Jb. Arch. I. XXX, 1915, pp. 127-9. (57) 322 B. C.

when Lysippus was in Greece. This then confirms the conjecture that the artist worked in Asia Minor between 316 and his death.

The evidence derived from the apoxyomenos, the Heracles Epitrapezius, and the Eros, supplemented by the "Old Fountain" base and the Polydamas base, is all perfectly consistent and harmonious. Whatever doubts may be raised as to one part or another are removed by the concensus of the whole. The foundation thus laid for our knowledge of Lysippian art is certain and dependable.

VITA

Franklin Plotinos Johnson was born at Osceola, Missouri, on March 17, 1896. He attended the Public and High Schools at Osceola, Drury College, and the University of Missouri, where he received his A. B. in 1914. He also received his A. M. in 1915 and was assistant in Archaeology and the History of Art in 1915-1916. His graduate work at Missouri was chiefly under the direction of Professor Pickard and Professor Manly. In 1919-1920 and 1920-1921 he was a student at the Johns Hopkins University and received the degree of Ph. D. in 1921. At Hopkins he worked with Professor Robinson in Archaeology, with Professor Miller in Greek, with Professor Ember in Egyptian and Arabic, and with Dr. Blake in Oriental History.